

an artistic point of view, nor called for by exigencies, either physical or spiritual,—being the sole cause of the wide departure from the original oblong, though the cruciform plan and curved termination of the east end, with other of the modifications it received, might have been introduced.—I consider, without betraying the beauty and truth of the art, provided the transference is not an end, and such as to make them one of the attributes of Christianity, to avoid nothing on the length, or cause of great loss of grandeur in their construction. That the first Christian churches had sides was owing to their being formed on the model of the Roman Basilica, which Christians placed at their residence, and as a symbolism, which, doubtless, had the influence in those changes. It is not to be denied, as a symbolism, should be avoided, by simpler means, and by not being with the same terms of fabrics as to what with the principles of art and beauty.

I wish it to be understood that I am not recommending the severer character of the Athenian temples exclusively, which were Doric and Ionic, chiefly the former: I would widen the field of expression, from the grave—the awful—of Greek Doric, to the more graceful yet solemn effect of the Roman Corinthian peristyle of the earlier Greco-Roman period. There is a calm dignity, highly befitting a religious edifice, about the Grecian Ionic, which it will be remembered was the sepulchral order of the Ionians. Nor would I confine myself to the simple parallelepipedal form, and aim at Greek sublimity by copying the temple plan: the solemn beauty and grandeur of the temple can be had consistent with every rational and artistic diversity, of external and internal arrangement, as the triple temple of the Acropolis (which exhibits the widest departure from the simple oblong) will satisfactorily attest. In fine, the temple character might be blended both inside and outside with all our necessary forms, which would not only go far to destroy associations of Paganism and stamp it as Christian, but give individuality and something of picturesque combination, which the Greek temple architecture generally lacks. Greek architecture is more ductile and more copious than it is generally supposed, and variety might be obtained in it without impairing its higher qualities. The interior of St. Stephen's, Walbrook, is something like the aspect it would assume on the inside,—an enlightened application of temple architecture to an interior. The exterior decorative expression suited to such an interior, or that such an interior would correspond with or suggest, is that for which I am here contending. Now, the octagonal form is admirably suited to the Protestant worship, and an octagonal peristyle would have the solemn beauty of the temple with but little of its association. But we could, if required, indicate the cross, which might have the peristyle applied either to the whole or to one limb only, as the chancel or choir portion, which, as the most sacred part of the edifice, it would not be improper so to distinguish. Indeed, there is nothing to prevent the use of any forms that might be deemed necessary to ecclesiastical edifices; or the full carrying out of the principles of church design. The temple character might even be had with clerestory arrangement, pedimenting, of course, but a qualified grandeur, and it might be truthfully obtained, as in the Gothic, in without the making of the real form. In short, I would see those elements that render Greek architecture expressive of the great and solemn—that breathes of deity and religion; but I would marry these to the plans which the ritual of the day and country requires; and for decorative embellishment I would draw upon our own natural and historical resources, and no longer satiate the eye of taste by the overrating change rung upon the honey-suckle and other ornaments of the Greek orders, while all mythic or sacrificial allusions could be omitted or substituted without weakening the qualities sought to be expressed. In fine, it is an advocacy of the right use of the colonnade in church architecture—the principle on which the peristyle disposition is founded,—that is the object of these remarks.

The column, like other features, depends for its effect upon its mode of treatment: it may be so treated as to beget insipidity and excite disgust in the spectator, as it really does in numerous extant buildings. Detached columns, I consider, are the essence of the grand style: the most powerful effects cannot be had without the colonnade in some shape, and attached columns must always fail to produce greatness, however heavily introduced. Palladio, though the most renowned of modern architects, appears to have understood the column, for he subordinated to the strangely subordinate place of ornamental appendage to his façades, which, standing what was their character, it could not be without a false coloration; and of this coloration his intention generally produced by such means that the most buildings of truly severe character have been spoiled by the introduction of principal features.

But columnar architecture has not only been misused, it has, when properly treated, been misapplied; i.e. applied to the wrong buildings. The Greeks and Romans confined it almost, and the Egyptians entirely, to their temples or mausolea, where it is most significant: the moderns omit it in their sacred edifices, and employ it where it is more or less discordant—to commercial edifices, to shops and buildings of the meanest use; nay, we offer insult to the sanctity of art by prostituting the most solemn elements of architecture to the embellishment of the gin-palace. At the Paris Bourse, the Birmingham Town-hall, and many buildings of purely secular purpose, the peristyle is profusely employed; while St. Peter's, at Rome, has not one insulated column,—I mean, of course, in the church itself, and on the scale of the principal order. The latter building owes its failure, I consider, entirely to its departure from the spirit of Greek architecture. Its interior produces, I believe, an impression of gaiety: it is beautiful, but not what we should expect from its dimensions, and what it might have been otherwise treated—sublime: imagine the interior effect of St. Peter's (and the remark applies as well to its London competitor), if, instead of the few black hideous pillars, its aisles had been divided by files of columns on the gigantic scale of the exterior order.

Nor is the ill consequence of deviation from the temple style less felt on the exterior: the façades of St. Paul's, the choicest of any of its class, are palatial rather than ecclesiastical. To avoid monotony, and produce the charm of variety, not to strike the imagination by the greatness of the whole, was evidently the aim of the designer.

To the shrine of religion, the most intrinsic and genuine qualities of art do of right belong. In it everything should be sterling—nothing meretricious. It should exhibit the most powerful effect, obtained in the most legitimate manner: e.g. by exquisite precision and truth of detail, along with simplicity and grandeur of general form, greatness of design, and purity of decoration. In the well-designed church the lower excellencies, as sensuous and abstract beauty, are sacrificed to the higher and more intellectual. The picturesque display that gratifies the eye is waived, as inconsistent with the idea of deity to be reflected. But in no architecture are these conditions so completely fulfilled as in the Greek. The temple ordonnance, in short, is the simplest arrangement that ever spoke so forcibly to the mind and imagination, or awoke emotions so numinous.

The few attempts hitherto made to render it available for ecclesiastical edifices have, for the most part, been made in a spirit of servile imitation, and have, therefore, failed to give satisfaction: make a fac-simile of a Greek temple, and it will look like a Greek temple, and can never, whatever the purposes it be applied to, look like anything else. St. Pancras Church, whatever purity of taste its origin was designed in too timid and narrow a spirit, and will not serve as an illustration of my suggestions; and St. Madeleine's at Paris (which, by the way, is a Roman example), besides being too much a reproduction, has failed through mistreatment, its character partaking more of richness

and sameness than of religious solemnity.

With regard to lighting, I would remark that to preserve its genuine expression and repose, windows should be commonly introduced behind a colonnade, the effect of which is perhaps in some measure impaired by windows, however skilfully inserted. Nevertheless, the objection so much urged against windows in connection with Greek or Roman colonnades arises, I am convinced, more from their mismanagement than from anything in the essential nature of the window. Common abiding canopies are wholly inadmissible: the filling up must be made architectural as well as the dressings, if it is to unite with them in the production of a whole. This condition fulfilled, there would be little complaint of want of harmony between windows and the columns before or otherwise associated with them. Why is it that the door harmonises with the rest in most buildings, modern as well as ancient? Because the valve or leaf is generally a design, and has some artistic taste exercised on its panneling and decoration, as well as on the architrave that surrounds it. I believe that division by wide mullions and transoms to receive the light is what our windows most want to render them fit associates for columnar architecture, and I believe such mullions and transoms are as proper in Classic as they are in Gothic. The window so divided, instead of being one large rectangular perforation, the vertical sides of which interfere with the columns in front of it, might become a series of small ornamentally shaped perforations, that would interfere with it (if at all) in but a very slight degree.

There is a far more substantial reason than that usually stated, why windows should be omitted within a portico or a loggia: the latter generally so much diminishes their utility by the obstruction of light, that in peripheral structures other or additional means of lighting must be resorted to.

But the objection to windows of whatever nature presents no great difficulty, I conceive, in ecclesiastical design. We are not dependent upon windows for light to churches: skylights, which might be variously and beautifully formed, are good substitutes. Light might be admitted through geometrically formed panels or compartments in cylindrical and flat ceilings; or, by that clerestory method, according to the theory of Mr. Fergusson (doubtless the true one), of the Greeks themselves; or it might be admitted after the manner of St. Madeleine's Church, Paris, through a segmental dome or domes. One large light in the ceiling produces a broad and simple distribution of light and shade below, and by the omission of apertures in the walls, another advantage is gained, viz. the exclusion of noise from without, which in large towns is worthy of attention. The admission of light in a central stream from above seems an appropriate arrangement in a place of worship, and will not be objected to by the advocate of symbolism.

Again, let me disclaim the advocacy of the mere reproduction of the Greek temple: I am but suggesting that true and artistic employment of the column which it exemplifies; an emulation of the speaking beauty, the sublime eloquence of the peristyle, and a devotion of it to its right purpose. It is not the form to which I would call attention, but its expression; not the fact, but the poetry of the temple; which might be aimed at as far as they consist with the essential and measured demands of accommodation and convenience. My suggestions all refer to these abstract qualities that constitute its excellence; and outcomes in which they inhere, as here viewed, can never be inconsistent with fitness in our churches, at variance with geometrical unity and truth, or opposed to the present modes of construction.

This I know could only be done by the architect capable of penetrating the spirit of the antique temple, and discriminating its peculiar qualities; but such an architect is a poet, who would employ his elements, however obtained, but as the symbols of his mission.